

Procedure Year: 2025

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Department: CO - Republic of North Macedonia

Record Owner: Ilmiasan Dauti

Created by: Ilmiasan Dauti,2/3/2025, 9:47 AM

Procedure Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Procedure Name: ASM-13848

Procedure Type: Closure

Last Modified by: Anna Chernyshova,2/14/2025, 2:53 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00117773	Regional Programme on Local Democracy in the Western Balkans 2 (ReLOaD 2)	CO - Republic of North Macedonia	Financially Closed	00122026	1/1/2021	12/31/2025

Approval Information

Approval Date: Thu Feb 13 00:00:00 GMT 2025

Approved By: Anna Chernyshova
<anna.chernyshova@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2025-02-14 02:53:59	Approved	Anna Chernyshova
Approval Request Submitted	2025-02-13 16:17:11	Started	Ilmiasan Dauti

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ☒ 3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Based on the inputs from the field and relevant partners, the project regularly introduced changes to the implementation strategy. Specifically, specifically, the project team has identified and reported on an increased number of changes in the workplace in the partner local government, especially administrative staff trained on LOD Methodology and Project Cycle Management (PCM). As a

result, an interactive course was created based on ReLOaD's tailor-made Project Cycle Management (PCM) training for local administration staff. This action was designed as requested by the Donor and approved by BoP. The training is uploaded on an existing e-knowledge platform for the local administration and is available to more staff in ReLOaD's partner local governments but also representatives of all local governments in North Macedonia in Macedonian and Albanian language including final test, custom certificate, and the additional working materials. This enables a wider reach of support created through intervention. The constant tracking of the changes in the external environment also helped formulate goals and indicators for the next phase of the project.

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☐ 3: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The Project is aligned with the UNDP's Strategic Plan (2022-2025) and contributes to the Signature solution 2: Governance. The Project's RRF includes two relevant IRRF indicators:

2.1 Open, agile, accountable and future-ready governance systems in place to co-create and deliver solutions to accelerate SDG achievement.

2.1.2. Number of measures in place to prevent illicit financial flows and improve the effectiveness, transparency and accountability of development financing and domestic resource mobilization, and

2.4 Democratic institutions and processes strengthened for an inclusive and open public sphere with expanded public engagement.

2.4.5 Number of regional, national and sub-national initiatives, policies, and strategies to protect and promote (2.4.5.a Civil society to function in the public sphere and contribute to sustainable development and 2.4.5.b Inclusive spaces, mechanisms and capacities for public dialogue)

The Project teams are duly monitoring and reporting against these indicators.

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory
----------	------------------	-------------------------------------

3. Are the project's targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains relevant for them?

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project team consistently monitors the work of CSOs, gathering structured data through Monitoring Reports (evidence attached) and CSO Narrative Reports to assess the impact of project activities on target groups, particularly vulnerable populations and youth, as well as how local priorities are being addressed. Feedback was also collected from CSO representatives during public debates on priorities for the open call, as well as during open days and consultative meetings held in eight partner municipalities. Stakeholder engagement has been a continuous focus, facilitated through the Advisory Group. Additionally, regular meetings with

the Project Board Forum and the National Board of Partners were conducted to share updates on project progress and insights from beneficiary feedback.

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- ☒ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The lessons learned throughout the Project were documented in the Project Progress Reports (evidence attached) and further enriched through regular project monitoring, which was discussed during staff meetings. Knowledge-sharing was facilitated through four Regional Conferences held to exchange the Project's best practices, with events organized in 2022, 2023, and 2024. At the regional level, the Project Board and the Project Board Forum, which included all national Boards of Partners, were effectively coordinated and implemented as planned. These management structures provided positive feedback on the Project's outcomes and expressed satisfaction with the progress made in partner localities. Additionally, an independent evaluation conducted in 2024 captured valuable lessons learned and best practices across the region, with its recommendations incorporated into the preparation of the Project's next phase.

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- ☒ 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- ☐ 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- ☐ 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

As documented in the progress report and monitoring tools, the project has successfully reached a significant number of beneficiaries. Two public calls were issued across eight partner municipalities, resulting in the implementation of 62 CSO projects and benefiting over 17,900 citizens, more than 50% of whom were women. The project has met the targets set in the RRF; however, a strong need for continued action in the region, including North Macedonia, remains. This necessity has been acknowledged with the launch of a new project phase, ReLOaD3.

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☒ 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

All project components, assessments and mapping exercises included gender aspects and disaggregated data so as to identify different needs and priorities for men and women. The project, as evidenced from the project monitoring tool, has concrete measures that are applied to ensure equal benefits for both genders. Moreover, a number of CSO interventions supported by the project targeted specifically women. Thus, 6764 women and 2,396 girls benefited from the intervention directly and indirectly (e.g. social services, economic empowerment, provision of equal opportunities, etc.). Links for two such projects are attached as evidence:

https://meta.mk/konechno-oslobodena-od-sindjirite-na-domashnoto-nasilstvo/?fbclid=IwAR0-dyTo8vPJdwB164OA5BoOgHXEM945RxTWistxvWgdvevbjndTgFqd_r8

https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=pfbid08PK9MXj91WzYaUovivnRWrNC8fLKAWUVBSdvZaGugbGNEnGoKxrQu3DXc2rirdQyl&id=100081617740370

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments were conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for high/substantial-risk projects and targeted assessments for moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented, and monitored for identified risks. Select this option for SESP exempted projects and/or categorized as low risk through the SESP.
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Social and environmental risks identified through the SESP were periodically monitored and assessed as part of the risk review and recorded in the risk log, with updates included in Progress Reports. The social and environmental risks were successfully managed across all project interventions, ensuring adherence to established safeguards. The project was structured to proactively consider potential social and environmental impacts and implement appropriate mitigation measures to ensure sustainability.

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☒ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution. Select this option for SESP Exempted projects.
- ☐ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The Project did not experience unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances.

Management & Monitoring

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Exemplary

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- ☒ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project had designed and implemented a comprehensive M&E plan, as set by the Project document and a Project Results Monitoring Tool has been developed and applied. The LFA Baselines, targets and milestones are regularly monitored (two-month period) and recorded in the Monitoring Tool, including sex disaggregated data and information on socially excluded citizens targeted with the action.

10. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- ☒ 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

All project structures, including the Project Board (regional), national Boards of Partners (BoP) and Advisory Group (AG) met regularly and discussed all relevant topics for successful achievement of the project objectives. The Board of Partners is comprised of relevant national institutions, EU and UNDP and the Advisory Board is comprised of civil society organizations and academia and advises the BoP on relevant topics. On the regional level, meetings of the Project Board and Project Board Forum (encompassing all national Board of Partners) are well coordinated and organized in accordance with the plan. Example of the minutes of the project board meeting is attached.

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- ☒ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- ☐ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

All identified project risks were recorded in the Risk log management system and Project Progress Report and presented and discussed at the BoP meetings. The Project team closely monitored and assess the risks, and different scenarios were proposed to overcome identified risks as well as mitigation measures.

Efficient

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Exemplary

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project has mobilized adequate funds to achieve intendent results. Three local governments Gostivar, Ohrid and Kriva Palanka have increased participation in the grants with 25% co-financing, and the remaining five local governments co-finance 20% of the grants.

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- ☒ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

All necessary procurements were planned and executed in line with the CO procurement plan and carried out efficiently. Due to its regional nature, in addition to the Country office's operational procedures, the Project developed its own Internal Standard Operational Procedures.

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- ☒ 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- ☐ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Cost efficiencies and value for money principles have been incorporated throughout all project interventions. The related expenditures and their effects were regularly monitored and reported in the key project reporting instruments (progress reports and financial reports, CDRs). Transparent procedures were applied in the selection of vendors in order to secure cost efficiency. The

project also developed Internal Operational Procedures to unify procedures in all COs. The project periodically updated monthly disbursement plan which tracks all plans and changes in delivery.

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was on track and delivered its expected outputs as planned.

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- ☒ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Regular reviews of the work plan have been conducted to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results. The annual work plans were endorsed by the BoP at the beginning of each calendar year. (attached as evidence).

17. Were the targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- ☒ 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project's interventions took into account diverse stakeholders groups ensuring that social inclusion principles are applied appropriately. The target groups were systematically identified and engaged during the implementation of the project. As a result, the Project partnered with 8 local governments, and through the grants scheme, 62 CSO projects were implemented to address the needs of the local population with focus on marginalized and socially excluded (women, children/persons with special needs, youth etc).

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: have technology and data risks been addressed specifically for closure, or continued use by partners or UNDP?

- ☐ 3: Yes, a) the implementation and closure followed good practices, such as UNDP’s digital standards and data principles; b) technology sustainability risks are addressed: hosting, licenses, intellectual property, data ownership, code documentation, or partner capacity (operations, maintenance and continued improvement); and c) post project scalability has been considered: digital public goods or reusability for other UNDP units. (All must be true)
- ☒ 2: Specific technology and data risks have been partially addressed for project closure, next to Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management.
- ☐ 1: Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied, but no specific practices to address technology or data risks are followed.
- ☐ The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

Sustainability & National Ownership	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

19. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The Project utilizes DIM approach; however, the national institutions were fully engaged in the decision-making through the project board and other participation mechanisms (Project Board, national of Partners and Advisory Groups).

20. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements8 adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☒ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was consistently tracking the changes in capacity of key implementation partners and adjusted implementation approaches accordingly. This was done in a way to ensure gradual transfer of implementation responsibility for the main project interventions from UNDP toward the partner institutions.

21. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☒ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The transition and phase-out arrangements include the continuation and scaling up of project interventions as part of a new four-year phase (ReLOaD3). The new phase will engage additional municipalities and work with institutional partners and higher-level governments to ensure broader and more effective implementation of transparent funding practices (LOD Methodology) on local and national level. This will ensure sustainability of project results beyond project duration.